

Sławomir Redo¹

Academic Council on the United Nations System

Criminological reflections on the Golden Rule and urban stewardship for safety²

Abstract. This public policy essay discusses the various criminological facets of the Golden Rule in the context of urban stewardship – the concept which emphasizes the role of the protection of the environment as a part of people’s natural habitat. Among these facets the right to safety in the Global North cities experiencing the influx of refugees and other migrants from the Global South deserves critical attention. It invites the question how to operationalize that right to the mutual advantage of such newcomers and native residents. In a broader socio-economic context of reducing inequalities promoted by the 2016-2030 United Nations Sustainable Development Agenda, the findings which suggest that both groups of residents appreciate a clean and safe habitat, and, finally, against the background of terrorist attacks in the Global North cities, the author of the essay advances the thesis that urban stewardship programmes/projects embracing concerned residents may be helpful to strengthen the feeling of safety in the cities.

Keywords: Earth jurisprudence, Golden Rule, inclusiveness, right to safety, terrorist attacks, United Nations Sustainable Development Agenda, urban stewardship, zero tolerance

1 Dr. hab. (Law/Criminology); Senior Adviser, Academic Council on the United Nations System (Vienna, Austria); F. United Nations Senior Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Expert and staff of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (ret.). E-mail: slawomir@redo.net

2 This article seeks further to systematize and develop some ideas from my earlier text “United Nations ‘Earth jurisprudence’, its Golden Rule, the ‘refugee problem’ and urban safety”. In: Kury, H, & Redo, S. *Refugees and Migrants in Law and Policy – Challenges and Opportunities for Global Civic Education*. Springer: Berlin- Heidelberg- New York (2018). The author thanks Prof. Dr., Dr. h.c. mult. Helmut Kury (Germany), Tamara Mitrofanenko (Consultant, United Nations Environmental Programme, Vienna), and Margaret Shaw (Crime and Social Policy Consulting, Montreal, QC, Canada) for their comments on an earlier draft of this text.

Introduction

The application of the time-honoured Golden Rule of ethical conduct “*Do unto others as you would have them do unto you*”, known to most of the legal cultures and religions, may be considered theoretically and practically. In the latter manner, in this public policy essay initially its author considers the contemporary relevance of that rule to sustainable development, particularly to Earth jurisprudence (EJ), which underlines the universality of reciprocity among people in their habitat. As an intermediate point, the author emphasizes the importance of public awareness for successful urban stewardship that includes urban environment, natural (EJ) and intercultural (public tolerance). In the rule’s criminological context, the essay discusses and interprets two recent court cases from Canada and Italy dealing with urban and public safety. From amongst several other such cases dealt with elsewhere, these two seem to offer diametrically different judgments that may signal the shifting of public sentiments in the Global North towards more qualified observance of host country’s rules of public conduct by immigrants. The author argues that through that qualified the Golden Rule regains the forgotten importance in the context of urban stewardship for safety (rights and duties). This public policy concept may be helpful in pursuing the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Agenda 2016-2030 (A/RES/70/1) as a participatory process for all urban residents (SDG 11), in line with SDG 16 which foresees peaceful and inclusive rule-of-law societies for sustainable development. Finally, the essay reviews practical principles regarding urban safety that operationalize the Golden Rule in Mechelen (Belgium) – one of the most advanced in intercultural integration Global North cities. Based on examples of urban stewardship for safety from Belgium and Canada, the author suggests that SDG goals 11 and 16 can be facilitated through environmental stewardship projects in a broader context of public and social welfare policies. Such projects and policies should support individual intercultural civic participation and incentivize natives and immigrants alike to be a part of one self-regarding morally urban community working for its safety.

Sustainable development

Since the beginning of the 1980s in social science and the beginning of the 1990s in academic Criminology, there has been a strong environmentalist interest emphasizing the role of preserving nature for the wellbeing of present and succeeding generations (“Green Criminology”). In 1997, in the International Court of Justice water dam on the Danube River case between Slovakia and Hungary, Justice Weeramanery noted in his opinion that sustainable development is one of the oldest ideas in human heritage (ICJ GL No 92/1997). Be this as it may, only in 1987 was the term “sustainable development” used at the United Nations its first

definition by the World Commission on Environment and Development, chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland, Norway's then Prime Minister. In the Commission's view, it is development that meets the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (A/42/187). The concept communicates that in the interest of the right to development of future generations, the development of the economy and civilization should not be pursued at the cost of exhausting the non-renewable natural resources and destruction of the environment.

Currently, the understanding of sustainable development extends to a self-generating, creative, albeit also conflicting mechanism for renewing socio-economic and other resources. It is geared toward their multiplication and, generally, the broadening of human intergenerational capital in any creative areas of humankind, including science and education - the necessary doorway to a change in mindset and behaviour (Redo, 2012, p. 233).

The first social science inroads into sustainable development may be credited, *inter alia*, to the comparative work on natural law by Heinrich Rommen (1897-1967). He argued that there are natural universal laws, defined in the philosophy of law, which are determined by nature, and are therefore universal (Rommen, 1947/1998). Today's sustainable development concept fits to emphasize the importance of these universal laws for humankind's survival.

Earth jurisprudence with its Golden Rule

"Earth Jurisprudence" (Berry, 2003) reflects the most fundamental sense of the Golden Rule because of reciprocity between nature and humankind and the impact people have on nature's integral functioning. In 2009 this academic concept was first launched in the United Nations (A/RES/64/196). In 2015 the United Nations Secretary-General argued that the Golden Rule, usually meant as "*Do unto others as you would have them do unto you*" only between people, is about their reciprocity with nature which:

"forms part of natural universal laws, and is a consistent feature in codes of conduct of indigenous communities governing their interactions with the natural world. It is also a fundamental principle of customary law. In customary law, reciprocal relationships, out of which the duty arises, result from a voluntary agreement between the parties affected. They create or acknowledge the duty of care. The reciprocal behaviour of the parties must, in some sense, be equal in value, meaning that the bond of reciprocity unites different people. In this regard, relationships within society must be sufficiently fluid so that the same duty one person owes another today may be reciprocated tomorrow. In other words, the relationship of duty must, in theory and in practice, be mutual" (A/70/268, paras. 40-41).

The background for the above argument must have come from a near-universal recognition of the importance of the protection of human habitat, documented in the many iterations of the World Values Surveys. Regardless of the respondents' habitat, whatever their level of subsistence and income, they were all almost universally concerned about environmental degradation. About 70% of respondents felt that the national laws and regulations of their countries did not go at all far enough to counter it (Leiserovitz et al. 2005; Redo 2017).

Earth jurisprudence and urban stewardship

In line with EJ, the UN Environmental Programme (UNEP) advances the related concept of urban stewardship, as follows:

“Sustainable livelihood in this context is in its letter and spirit about ‘shared responsibility’ for public spaces - the same responsibility that should prompt us to preserve our natural resources for future generations. Hence the question: If we should teach rural youth how to take pride in being stewards of the land, should we not educate city dwellers about keeping cities’ green and public spaces in order” (UNEP 2016, p. 15).

There is good reason to ask this question. In response to it, one could say that public space is a suitable social laboratory for urban stewardship (Romolini et al. 2012). In this context, public space may also be a ground to discuss how far one may go about crime prevention in its environmental context, as a universal way to assimilate respective global values by native and other city dwellers.

This is what is called for in SDG 11: “Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable”. This involves in particular enhancing inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacities for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries (11.3) and the provision of universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities (11.7).

Broken windows theory and urban stewardship for safety

Therefore, this and the following sections of this essay explore how far policies ensuing from national laws and regulations may indeed go to foster safety in the urban environment in which most of the people on Earth live. The criminological inspiration for urban safety policies originally came from the USA. In 1973 a field experiment in one high-crime and in one low-crime area demonstrated the process through which seemingly abandoned automobiles, left without license plates and with hoods up, were vandalized. The abandoned car in a high-crime area was

vandalized within 10 minutes and was completely stripped within 24 hours. The abandoned car in a low-crime area remained untouched for a full week until the experimenter himself damaged the car with a sledgehammer. Within a few hours, the abandoned car was vandalized, stripped, and turned over (Zimbardo 1973; Zimbardo 2007). This experiment inspired to formulate a zero-tolerance “Broken Windows” theory (BWT/Wilson and Kelling 1982, p. 32), according to which vandalism and more serious crimes can occur anywhere once the sense of mutual regard and the obligations of civility are lowered by actions that seem to signal that “no one cares.” Metaphorically, a broken window left unrepaired will soon lead to the breaking of all other windows in a building (Welsh et al. 2015, p. 449).

BWT was scientifically verified in the USA, UK and the Netherlands (Braga et al. 2015; Steenbeck and Kreis 2015). Although analysts are not in agreement whether there are enough hard facts in BWT’s favour in the analysed neighbourhoods because of the preponderance of subjective data (the perception of the fear of crime) over objective data (police-recorded crime), blurred additionally by the unmatchability of census tracks with official crime data, BWT enjoys widespread attention among academics, urban policy makers and managers. Some experts claim (Braga et al. 2015, p. 580) BWT’s noteworthy crime control gains across a variety of forms of violent, property, drug, and other disorderly conduct (broken bottles, graffiti, dog feces, litter, cigarette butts, etc.). Others note that there is mixed evidence in the case of self-reported offending of the residents of the surveyed neighbourhood. However, most of the experts concur that traditional offending is more prevalent among residents of poorly kept neighbourhoods (Ellis et al. 2009, p. 52). No wonder therefore that BWT is an interesting proposition to policy makers keen to instrumentalize its founding idea, to pursue urban stewardship for safety, understood as a mutual regard between residents and other city dwellers, both committable to civic ecology in city’s environment.

Domestic jurisprudence regarding the Golden Rule

This mutual civic regard is the “Golden Rule’s” gist. By EJ it has been extended to the human habitat, whose most liveable parts are urban areas. Hence, the question concerning the “new factor” in urban sustainable livelihood involving freshly incoming refugees and other migrants to cities, and their alleged and actual menace to urban safety is now hotly debated in the “Global North” countries. In short, can they become a part of successful urban stewardship for safety?

A *kirpan* (a knife as the emblematic article of faith carried by an Orthodox Sikh in fulfilment of the 1699 religious commandment) in two court cases particularly highlighted the importance of the debate over multicultural aspects of urban safety in the Northern countries.

In 2001, in Montreal (Quebec, Canada), a high-school student - the owner of such a *kirpan*, was barred by the school from carrying it. The school did not accept the explanation that it was a mandatory part of his religious dress. He was advised that he will be allowed to carry a non-metal knife. The matter was brought to court. In 2006, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled in favour of the claimant and freedom of religion over safety, including barring other students from bringing and carrying in school other weapons (e.g. scissors, bats). The Court dismissed the argument that the cases involving airline security have resulted in the banning of *kirpans* on planes. The Court was of the view that whereas people know each other in a school, planes will always carry different people who never know each other. Thus, there is little opportunity to judge whether a passenger is violent, while the claimant himself was not violent in a school setting. The Court opined that carrying this offensive weapon was a civic virtue which exceptionally upholds the multiculturalism of Canadian society, even against, otherwise, a general ban to carry any other weapons at school (*Multani v Commission scolaire Marguerite-Bourgeoys* (2006, 1 S.C.R. 256, 2006 SCC 6).

In sum, in the circumstances in question, the Court applied quite an appreciative and inclusive interpretation of the Golden Rule as a legal tool for conflict resolution, that lets immigrants exercise multiculturalism by upholding their dress code with minimum harm to a host society (“dress as you please as long as your dress code does not present a threat to others”). This “law’s version of the Golden Rule” (Beatty 2008, p. 103) has nothing to do with intercultural reciprocity within a host society, but contains an element of mutual civic regard and empathy with others, known also in the Sikh religion (“*Precious like jewels are the minds of all. To hurt them is not at all good. If thou desirest thy Beloved, then hurt thou not anyone’s heart*”).

That mutual civic regard and empathy was questioned in 2017 by the Italian Supreme Court of Cassation. It ruled against an adult Sikh migrant who wanted to carry such a ceremonial knife in public. In the Court’s view: “*An attachment to one’s own values, even if they are lawful in the country of origin, is intolerable when it causes violating the laws of the host country... A multi-ethnic society is a necessity, but it cannot lead to the formation of conflicting cultural groups...precluding the unity of the cultural and judicial fabric of our country, which identifies public safety as an asset to defend and as such bans carrying weapons and objects*” (Corte di Cassazione, 24084/2017).

This broadly interpreted public security concern shows that the Italian court in the security interest of a host society compromised the Golden Rule into a rather prohibitive Silver Rule “*Do as you please as long it does not harm others*”.

Both somewhat disparate verdicts were perhaps justified to some extent by the various age of claimants and their respectively assessed dispositions to integrate themselves into the mainstream of a host society. But the shift from the Golden Rule to the Silver Rule may be prompted by the worsening local perception of public

safety (the influx of migrants, in the case of Italy, is uncontrolled), so the *kirpan* became more threatening after all. Incidentally, on 29 January 2017, a mass shooting occurred at the Islamic Cultural Centre of Quebec City. Six people were killed and nineteen others injured by a native Quebecoise. Rhetorically: would such a public safety incident influence the Golden Rule followed in the Canadian Supreme Court's verdict, if it would have occurred when the verdict allowing to retain the *kirpan* was handed down?

Rhetoric aside, surely such incidents (and there have been many across the globe) have further recast the debate over the acceptable content of the religious right to a certain dress code and to public displays of faith. In the Global South countries (e.g. Cameroon, Chad, Senegal (Allison 2015)) and in the North (e.g. Belgium, Germany, France (Dearden 2016)) the question has arisen whether a Muslim woman wearing a *burqa* (an outer garment covering the whole body, head and face) may be prohibited from doing so in public spaces, because that element of a non-mandatory dress code (in other words, a cultural artefact) may disguise her as a terrorist. The results of a quite extensive public safety analysis of this matter ensuing from the French *burqa* ban (Nanwani 2011), suggested that while the ban implies that all women wearing *burqas* may be perceived as potential terrorist suspects, its counter-terrorism effect remains questionable, if not unproven. Reportedly, this is because only one analyst pointed to one burglary committed in such a disguise (Nanwani 2011, p. 1475).

Thus, rather than going any further into, at times, dubious pros and cons of this or that choice and some debatable crime prevention effects, one should ask whether any piece of religious or cultural identity may, or should, be sacrificed on the altar of a larger freedom (to use this UN term)? If yes, how to go about with that piece through urban stewardship involving immigrants, so as to show the Golden Rule's mutual civil regard in action? In other words, how to overcome the hurdles in multicultural integration by managing the aspects related to it of a public safety problem, aspects that eventually should contribute to the strengthening of one culture of lawfulness and prevent the emergence of parallel societies? To this end, this essay will first offer a respective academic insight into the roots of urban stewardship for safety, and, then, share practical recommendations regarding its exercising in a multicultural environment.

Self-governance and multicultural urban stewardship for safety

Regarding academic insights, the revival of commerce strengthened by the surplus agrarian merchandise sold in Flanders (Dutch-speaking northern region of modern-day Belgium), led there to the first municipal organization in Europe, chartered in 1035. Since then new charters with town-oriented privileges started

appearing, with the most influential in 1107/8 - the Magdeburg Charter “which clearly associates spiritual welfare and material gain with the defense of Christianity and warfare against pagans and infidels” (Constable 2016, p. 197).

With rationale changing in time, externally and internally divisive multicultural issues, other European cities followed that and other similar municipal German law. Until the 1830s it retained its imprint in many cities located in what is now contemporary Poland and Western Ukraine. Under that law urban councils took increasingly autonomous care of commerce, order and safety, taxes, customs, in some cases of consular protection and other aspects of a city’s internal and external life. With all the conflicts between local and central authority and diverging city-to-city customs, they all have become a vibrant corporate resource for common policy and legal culture, also at the State level (Berman 1983, chapters 12 & 13; Berman 2003, p. 34; 123-124).

That was not the case in Islamic cities. Their spiritual welfare and material gain has been formed and guided by the original religious rationale. Therefore, “*they lacked corporate unity and an independent character...The crucial difference, in comparison with the West, was that, on the one hand, Islamic cities and town were never sworn communities and never consisted of religious guilds or brotherhoods, and, on the other hand, they were never incorporated and never given charter of rights and liberties... Islam lacked both the zeal to reform and redeem secular society and the concept that competing plural polities and legal systems can serve as instruments of such reform and redemption*” (Berman 1983, pp. 362-363).

In the above context, in the now global concept of EJ, the universalization of environmental protection and urban stewardship are elements of a new moral imperative of sustainable development. In the United Nations it goes beyond this or other traditional rationale for cities’ development. Both elements particularly well inscribe themselves into urban law of Northern countries, whose cities are strongly corporative, autonomous and keen on implementing modern safety standards proposed by the Broken Windows Theory. These cities are also the main addresses called by refugees and migrants. Like native city dwellers, they equally share environmental awareness. So how can multicultural urban stewardship for safety demonstrate this, in Golden Rule terms?

Examples of multicultural urban stewardship for safety

There is one Swiss and a few US examples of civic ecology projects involving immigrants (Redo 2017; The JM Kaplan Fund 2009). However, the most criminologically-relevant examples come from Canada. Canada remains one of the few countries in the world with an active and expansive immigration policy. It aims

to admit the equivalent of 1% of its total population of about 34 million each year. Canada has 21% of foreign-born residents (Castles et al. 2014, p. 134).

The first example comes from the Canadian “Parc-Extension” project, so named after the residential area in Montreal inhabited by more than a hundred cultural communities (WICI 2014). Reportedly, women and girls living in them face daily various structural hurdles in the way to their full integration: e.g. linguistic and cultural barriers, important family burdens, psychological and other pressures caused by migration (WICI 2014, p. 7). One of their safety concerns has been the reactions to the dress code of Muslim women (e.g. head covering). In the above expert report opinion, this context not only marked those women as more vulnerable to discrimination, marginalization, poverty, and isolation, but also more vulnerable to sexist violence.

The Montreal Parc-Extension study was concerned with violence experienced by women and girls in general, and not from members of their own communities or families. This was its big advantage.

Residents audited for safety reported that young people were most likely to be the victims of violent acts like harassment and assault. They felt to be the ones that cause insecurity perceived as loitering, drug use, delinquency, and youth crime. However, in a seven-item questionnaire on safe planning of public spaces, the replies concerning the layout and maintenance of public spaces, i.e. living together in a clean and hospitable environment “turned out to be the most important issue in [the] questionnaire” (WICI 2014, p. 14). Areas identified as problematic were streets, back lanes, parks, and metro stations. The researchers concluded that graffiti, litter and the lack of maintenance seemed to affect strongly residents’ perception of safety and their sense of belonging to the neighbourhood (WICI 2014, p. 14).

The second example comes from Mississauga (Ontario) - another Canadian city, near Toronto (WICI 2010). That city has over 700,000 inhabitants, the majority of whom do not speak English as a native language. Its local government committees on Sexual Assault and against Women Abuse implemented a safety audit sponsored by the Catholic Crosscultural Services (CCS), a non-governmental organization that provides a wide range of services to assist in refugees’ and immigrants’ integration, including counselling service on countering violence against women.

One of the safety audit methods pursued and assessed in this project was a women’s interethnic team walking into places they did not feel safe in: local parks, shopping malls, a shopping complex with an underground parking garage and to a low-income area with subsidized housing with loitering youth. On the exploratory walks the women engaged with the users of the space and found that their cultural diversity was advantageous, since many of the people they approached did not speak English, so the volunteers acted as interpreters. This allowed local voices to be included in the audits.

The age of safety audit implementers varied between 20-65. These were refugee women and immigrants from diverse cultural backgrounds. Generally, this pan-Canadian project implemented in several municipalities provided recent immigrants with an opportunity to take co-responsibility for their new communities - also UNEP's idea. In some project areas it also "*allowed CCS to expand the scope of its work on violence against women and girls encompassing the public realm in addition to the private*" (WICI 2014, p. 20).

On recommendations and conclusion

Three points below determined the way in which the recommendations and conclusion of this criminological essay are addressed:

1. A statement by Bart Somers, Mayor of Mechelen (Flanders, Belgium) at the side event "The role of the criminal justice system in prevention violent extremism leading to terrorism" during the UN Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (Vienna, 22-26 May 2017);
2. Two terrorist acts in the UK (of 25 May 2017 in Manchester and of 3 June 2017 in London) allegedly committed by British citizens of Islamic origin, which resulted in the killing of 31 people, including foreigners;
3. Two respective statements by the Prime Ministers of Poland and the UK in reaction to these acts:
 - a. by Beata Szydło, the Prime Minister of Poland, member of a conservative party, who commented on the first attack in which one Polish couple died, orphaning two daughters. She asked: "*Where are you headed, Europe? Rise from your knees and from your lethargy, or you will be crying over your children every day*", and saying that Poland "*will not participate in the Brussels elites' folly*" (AP, 24 May 2017);
 - b. by Theresa May, the Prime Minister of UK, member of a conservative party, who commented on the second attack: "*Our society should continue to function in accordance with our values. But when it comes to taking on extremism and terrorism, things need to change... [I]t is time to say enough is enough.*" (Reuters, 4 June 2017).

Addressing the first point, that side event had on its agenda the question of mutual civic regard and urban stewardship for safety, which was addressed by the Mayor of Mechelen. This Flemish town located in the Antwerp-Brussels agglomeration of 3.2 million inhabitants, has only 86,000 residents, comprising 128 nationalities, with a 20% Muslim population. Awarded in 2016 with the World Mayor Prize, since the beginning of his office in 2001, the Mayor has transformed this rather neglected small city into one of the most desirable living places in Belgium that may serve as the Golden Rule benchmark.

The press release issued on the occasion of granting the award reflects Mayor's United Nations side event's introductory statement. An excerpt reads as follows:

"It may be recalled that Belgian communities with large Muslim populations came under the spotlight, when it became apparent that many of the perpetrators of the 2015 terrorist attacks in France came from or had connections to Molenbeek, a working-class district of Brussels. Per capita, more young Muslim men from Belgium joined the fighting in Syria and Iraq than from any other European country - and many came from Flemish towns and cities between Antwerp and Brussels. There was one exception" [...]: none of its young Muslims has joined Middle East terrorist groups.

Long before the flow of refugees from the Middle East and Africa became officially a 'crisis' in the summer of 2015, the city recognised the utmost importance of integration. In an interview with World Mayor, the Mechelen Mayor says: [...] 'If we consistently, not selectively, put our fundamental principles - I am talking equal opportunities, non-discrimination, in addition to equality between men and women and freedom of speech etc. - into practice, then we make the model of rule of law and democracy more appealing, more attractive than extremist alternatives.' Perhaps unusual for a liberal politician, Bart Somers is tough on crime. Indeed, he has been labelled a law-and-order mayor and given the nickname 'Mr Zero Tolerance'. Safety and security are essential for people to strive for success and happiness. Mechelen has provided its police force with more resources and has installed more CCTV cameras than any other town in Belgium.

When asked what have immigrants contributed to Mechelen, Mayor Somers replies: 'The immigrant does not exist, just as the autochthon does not exist. The 86,000 residents of Mechelen are all unique and all different'.

During the height of the refugee crisis, Mechelen was the only city in Belgium that specifically asked to be allowed to house people fleeing the war zones of the Middle East. While there were people in Mechelen who were opposed to the city asking to house refugees, the Mayor felt that a city that strived for justice and humanism could not look away. The administration offered the Red Cross a piece of land and buildings for a temporary refugee camp. The city also developed a comprehensive programme, including language classes and introductory courses to Belgian society, staffed by volunteers. The Mayor says the opportunity of working together with the newcomers freed Mechelen residents of their fear of refugees. When the refugees left, Mayor Somers thanked them because 'they have made our city better and not vice versa.' He continued: 'Our shelter initiative cost us some money and caused our administration some efforts, but they were perhaps the best efforts of 2016'" (Press release 2017).

Further, at the United Nations side event the Mayor explained his ten principles of multicultural urban stewardship for safety, as follows:

1. *Accept the 'reality' of perception of insecurity among large segments of the population. Security is principle number one if you want to open minds towards diversity. People feeling insecure, do behave insecure and act defensive, excluding others. Act on it as a social responsibility. Know who lives in your community house-by-house, keep the city streets clean and enhance visible security (i.e. direct and indirect police presence through street cameras);*
2. *Have an inclusive future-oriented city policy narrative. 'Looking back to time past' does not satisfy anybody. First it excludes segments of your population and 'times past' are by definition bygone, never to return;*
3. *Avoid group thinking, 'them against us'. Each of us act as individuals having commonalities within larger interacting and intertwined groups. The city narrative is that diversity enriches the whole and symbolic actions/messages to this end are common;*
4. *Counter segregation in housing blocks, schools, sport clubs, scouts. For instance, Mechelen has reached out to groups of parents to have children attending 'concentration schools' within their neighbourhoods while guaranteeing the quality levels of education provided. In turn, 'native' schools have been reaching out to diversify the traditional pools of school recruitment;*
5. *Integration takes efforts on both ends. Awaiting behaviour change from one group only, does not bring the hoped-for results. It is not about 'they' but about 'us' and this demands a common effort;*
6. *Provide an equal level playing field. Many of the immigrant children are 2nd or 3rd generation born and raised locally, considering the city as 'theirs' but not necessarily benefitting from the same opportunities offered. From children with an immigrant background, they have to grow into citizens of a shared city;*
7. *Diversity will only be attractive when promises for a better life through individual education and professional achievement become reality. Racism and discrimination have no place;*
8. *Do create assimilation opportunities such as providing linguistic education in Dutch. Mastering the local language automatically offers better professional opportunities within the local job market;*
9. *Invest in a counter-'identity' narrative. Nothing is wrong being a proud Flemish, proud Muslim, proud Catholic, proud 'identity' as long as it combines this pride with being a proud city-citizen. Mechelen for instance prides itself as a community of having none of its youngsters joining FTFs [foreign terrorist fighters] - a joint and successful effort (but never guaranteed).*

10. Naivety has no place in the above. Incidents and accidents are prone to happen - but the policy line is set out. Manage expectations in realistic terms. For instance, police are not social workers and social workers are not intelligence officers. However, synergy between both is required to provide a better city service to the city community” (Somers 2017).

In conclusion, one could sum up that there are several vibrant and compelling arguments, field observations, urban management practices and scientific evidence which document that urban stewardship for safety is quite a viable approach in the implementation of Goal 11 of the United Nations Sustainable Development Agenda 2016-2030. It seems that not one or another religious or cultural dress’ artefact matters in public safety so much as what a person manifestly demonstrating it holds inside his/her mind, and how that mind can be empowered to think in terms of a global culture of lawfulness.

However, in contrast with this summary seem to stand the remaining points.

Addressing the second point, neither Manchester nor London is a small town, Mechelen is not Brussels, Brussels is neither London nor Manchester, etc., and the pace of absorption of immigrants into a social fabric of a host society is a big issue. There is no way to guarantee that they all will be successfully integrated in any place. Moreover, challenges and demands experienced in mega-cities may not only require “more of the same”, but rather adaptations and qualitatively different urban policies. Hence for multicultural integration inevitable as is, there is no “silver bullet” solution. However, there should be no other rule for public safety than gold.

Addressing the third point, the Flemish historical and current equivocal experience in dealing with immigrants is very informative and helpful for the European Union’s efforts to identify viable avenues to continue with multicultural integration and make it work better than now. Urban stewardship for safety seems to be one such avenue.

In the present “urban century” the urban law and policies, which in Europe have started ten centuries ago and develop to this day, both document their liberal progressive potential and integrative power. Against the substantially different ethnic background of countries whose two conservative Prime Ministers expressed their seemingly complimentary public safety concerns (Poland - about 1% of foreign born population, UK - about 10% plus an 11% ethnic minority population³), continuing the advances of multiculturalism in the Global North through a variety of integrative methods for living safely together in the urban habitat must be supported by new methods, so eventually these concerns will be addressed more successfully than now.

Rhetoric and counter-rhetoric of multiculturalism aside, a cradle-to-grave genuinely democratic education is urgently needed, starting with learning the host country’s language(s), appreciating gender mainstreaming, pursuing vocational

3 Castles et al. 2014, p. 272.

training for jobs, and countering discrimination (principles 7 and 8). Difficult, pioneering and long-term as progressing with multiculturalism is, residents of countries and their authorities to whose doors immigrants are knocking, only by learning these principles from one another, may be able to welcome them with a smile on their face. There are many more evidence-based integration programmes worth testing than just “Zero Tolerance” (ICPC 2014, p. 72). By the very nature of integration all involve mutuality, and most of them operate in an urban environment. Premised on the Golden Rule, in practice such programmes should evenly involve and be exercised by natives and newcomers. Their joint success may fly in the face of sceptics, especially those gripped by the fear of crime, by anti-immigrant attitudes and reactionary public beliefs. Contrary to them, criminological evidence clearly shows that the so called “Immigrant paradox” (Redo 2017) works as a protective factor against criminality in host countries (ICPC 2014, p. 66).

How to keep the Golden Rule standard locally is shown in the Mayor’s statement. Principle 3 encourages to look for a middle ground between liberal and conservative proposals to counter crime and violence. Principles 5 and 6, *de facto* include the Golden Rule through “shared responsibility” in a shared city.

Globally, it follows that the UN SDGs concerning urban safety fit exactly this train of thought which does not leave anybody behind,⁴ but requires the active participation of all city residents in terms of implementing their rights and meeting their responsibilities. The pan-Canadian local women safety/audit projects empowered immigrant women to “take the law into their own hands”, i.e. they allowed them to discuss their concerns with the local municipalities, which helped to develop some solutions – a new experience, if one considers that in the native places they came from to Canada, their empowerment was not a part of city life.

The author shares the Mayor’s view that “naivety has no place in the above” (principle 10). Not only because some of Mechelen’s youngsters apparently did join foreign terrorist fighters⁵ (hence understandable is also his caution expressed in principle 9), but also the UN narrative to “leave no one behind” *de facto* recognizes that crime may be a normal part of life for those eventually left behind.

Obviously, social welfare policies may be helpful to reduce their number in conflict with the law in a democratic society, in its courts and prisons. This may be taken for granted. This is the most basic, albeit too traditional in my view,

4 The commitment to “leave no one behind”, a term coined by the UN Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Agenda, is mentioned in the Preamble and in the UN SDG Agenda (A/RES/70/1). It underlines that the goals set by the Agenda will only be considered as achieved if they are met also for the lowest income quintile of the population and if there is no discrimination related to social categories such as age, gender or ethnicity (GDI 2015, p. 3).

5 See report for the Dutch Presidency of the Council of the European Union (ICCT 2016, p. 5) which informs about 14 foreign terrorist fighters coming from Mechelen.

understanding of social welfare. For it does not motivate to advance individual qualifications to become a part of one social and residential community of bread-winners. It spells integration problems and eventual parallel societies rather than one moral community.

From the perspective of criminology, or - let alone - SDG 16, it is very clear that it would indeed be extremely naïve to think otherwise. And yet, even those eventually left behind with criminal court verdicts should stand a chance to be rehabilitated and reintegrated. Only habitual offenders - a small but the hardest fraction of those left behind - should be in focus of a tough and sound reaction. “Zero tolerance” for terrorists is a part of that reaction. Those involved in the implementation of the SDGs should work hand-in-hand with practitioners of crime prevention and criminal justice and academics to make that reaction sound indeed, in line with the UN standards and norms. They are not cast in stone. When a Member State says that “enough is enough”, casting them can be quite incisive and reconstitutive. Should indeed this be the case, then surely these new standards and norms will function as a progressive power lens. In the UN Charter’s spirit of progressive development of international law (art. 13 (1) (a)), and in line with the UN SDGs (particularly 16.a) their focus will be on negotiating new inroads into the prevention of terrorism. Failures of multicultural integration will be analysed through the spectrum of counter measures (e.g. justice and global civic education responses) with a view to successful integration.

Nowadays, irrespective of legal culture and religious differences, civic urban environmentalism for order and safety enjoys wide academic and public consensus (i.e. the “Broken Windows Theory”/“Zero Tolerance”). Mutual regard - the Golden Rule’s essence, whether motivated by civicism and/or faith - every day needs to be reinvigorated and put to test. It helps to prevent forming parallel societies which occasionally manifestly act in their own ways - aware of their rights but not of common responsibility for the host city’s welfare and one-home rules.

It changes little that the Golden Rule is in a holy script, and “sustainable development” is “one of the oldest ideas in human heritage”. To benefit from one or another in life requires everyday commitments and implementation of rights and obligations by immigrant and native city dwellers alike (principle 5). This is the condition *sine qua non* for making the Golden Rule and urban stewardship work for safety. If the Golden Rule works via EJ with people of different legal cultures, so as to meet better their obligations vis-à-vis themselves and Mother Earth, then urban stewardship for safety can be a vehicle for safer driving towards 2030 and beyond.

In sum, in the light of the evolving actions, some multicultural integration efforts may fail, some others may work. In the context of more comprehensive public policies, urban stewardship for safety should be given a chance. How viable this particular chance is, depends not only on the grass-roots level near-universal environmental awareness, but also what the Governments will do in the next few years in terms of the implementation of their commitments to protect climate. If this

will remain a divisive issue, then self-governance efforts to integrate immigrants under the *chapeau* of global environmental protection may in a few years become futile. In a new moral climate, a coal-miner welcoming with a smiling face an immigrant may be a rather distant and rare case of an unaverred civic regard, showing to newcomers the readiness for integration (principle 1). The alternative proposition, i.e. of assimilation may change the Golden Rule not so much into the Silver Rule as into the Iron Rule “*Do what pleases me*”, requiring to follow unreservedly the standards and norms of a host society with nothing in return. Those who will recall how far the German Reich went applying its standards and norms to Jews by forcing them to clean its cities’ streets, may feel extremely uneasy. The concept of urban stewardship for safety will easily be denigrated if not dehumanized unless it will be equally well implemented by all urban residents.

Looking back into the past gives only the allure of “good old times” returning (principle 2). Various religions and ideologies contemporarily are fond of this strategy, writes Berman (1983, pp. 15-16 and 45). Paraphrasing him, the opposite way, i.e. looking forward is to pursue a common language of justice for humanity, so indeed there will be better times ahead of us. Since the benefits of immigration outweigh the costs (ICPC 2014, pp. 65-66), in that language the United Nations is the best speaker for all and for a more prosperous future.

REFERENCES

- A/42/187 (Annex). Our common future. From one earth to one world. Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development. 11 December 1987. Retrieved from <http://www.un-documents.net/ocf-ov.htm>.
- A/70/268. Harmony with nature. Report of the Secretary-General. 4 August 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org>.
- A/71/266. Harmony with nature. Note by the Secretary-General. 1 August 2016. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org>.
- A/RES/64/196. Harmony with nature. 21 December 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org>.
- A/RES/70/1. Transforming our world: the 2030 agenda for sustainable development. 25 September 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org>.
- Allison, S. (2015, November 18). Senegal considers burqa ban to stop terrorists disguising in Islamic dress. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world>.
- AP/The Associated Press. (2017, May 24). Poland critical of EU policy on taking in migrants, Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com>.
- Beatty, D. M. (2004). *The Ultimate rule of law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berman, H. J. (1983), *Law and revolution. The formation of the Western legal tradition*. Cambridge, Mass., London, England: Harvard University Press.

CRIMINOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS ON THE GOLDEN RULE AND URBAN...

- Berman, H. J. (2003). *Law and revolution. The impact of the Protestant reformations on the Western legal traditions*. Cambridge, Mass., London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Bell, M. (2003). Thomas Berry and an Earth Jurisprudence: An exploratory essay. *The Trumpeter*, 19 (1), 69-79.
- Braga, A. A., Welsh, B. C., & Schnell, C. (2015). Can policing disorder reduce crime? A systematic review and meta-analysis, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 52(4), 567-588.
- Castles, S., De Haas, H., & Miller M., J. (2014). *The Age of migration. International population movements in the modern world*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Constable, G. (2016). *Crusaders and crusading in the twelfth century*, London: Routledge
- Corte di Cassazione (24084/2017). Re. Singh Jatinder. Prima Sezione Penale. Retrieved from <http://www.giurisprudenzapenale.com/2017/05/16/una-recente-sentenza-della-cassazione-in-tema-di-scriminanti-culturali/>.
- Dearden, L. (2016, December 6). Burqa bans: After Angela Merkel calls for prohibition on full veils, what is the situation in other European countries?, *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk>.
- Ellis, L., Beaver, K & Wright, J. (2009). *Handbook of crime correlates*. Elsevier/Academic Press: Oxford.
- GDI/German Development Institute. (2015). Translating an ambitious vision into global transformation. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Loewe, M. & Rippin, N. (Eds.), 7, Bonn: German Development Institute.
- ICCT/International Center for Counter-terrorism. (2016). The foreign fighters phenomenon in the European Union. Profiles, threats & policies. Prepared for the Netherlands National Coordinator for Security and Counter-terrorism on the occasion of the Dutch Presidency of the Council of the European Union. Drafted by Boutin, B., Chauzal, G., Dorsey, J., Jegerings, M., Paulussen, Ch., Pohl, J., Reed, A., Zavagli, S., doi: 10.19165/2016.1.02. Retrieved from https://www.icct.nl/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/ICCT-Report_Foreign-Fighters-Phenomenon-in-the-EU_1-April-2016_including-AnnexesLinks.pdf.
- ICJ/International Court of Justice (92/1997). *Report*. Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project, Hungary v Slovakia, Judgment, Merits, 7:110.
- ICPC/International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (2014). 4th international report. Crime prevention and community safety: Trends and perspectives. ICPC: Montreal.
- Leiserovitz, A. A., Kates R.W., Parris, T. M. (2005). Do global attitudes and behaviors support sustainable development?. *Environment* 47 (9), 22-38.
- Multani v Commission scolaire Marguerite-Bourgeoys (2006, 1 S.C.R. 256, 2006 SCC 6). *Judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada*. Retrieved from <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/15/index.do>.
- Nanwani, S. (2011). The burqa ban: An unreasonable limitation on religious freedom or a justifiable restriction, *Emory International Law Journal*, 25,1431-1475.
- Press release. (2017, February 14). Bart Somers. Mayor of Mechelen, Belgium. Winner of the 2016 World Mayor Prize. Retrieved from http://www.worldmayor.com/contest_2016/profile-mechelen-mayor.html.

- Redo, S. (2012). *Blue criminology. The power of the United Nations ideas to counter crime globally*. Helsinki: Helsinki Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations.
- Reuters. (2017, June 4). Text-UK Prime Minister May's statement following London attack. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/article/britain-security-may-statement-idUSL8N1J10GH>.
- Romolini, M, Brinkley, W. & Wolf, K. L. (2012). What is urban environmental stewardship? Constructing a practitioner-derived framework. Research Note PNW-RN-566, United States Department of Agriculture. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265622255>.
- Rommen, H. A. (1947/1998). *The natural law. A study in legal and social history and philosophy*. : Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Somers, B. (2017). Statement by Mayor Bart Somers (Mechelen, Belgium) at the side event “The role of the criminal justice system in prevention violent extremism leading to terrorism” at the twenty-sixth session of the United Nations Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (Vienna, Austria, 22-26 May 2017).
- Steenbeek, W., & Kreis, Ch. (2015). Where Broken Windows should be fixed: Toward identification of areas at the tipping point. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 52(4), 511-533.
- The JM Kaplan Fund. (2009, October 14). The immigrants & parks collaborative. *Urban Omnibus*. Retrieved <http://urbanomnibus.net/2009/10/the-immigrants-and-parks-collaborative/>.
- UNEP/United Nations Environmental Programme. (2016). *Environment, religion and culture in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Nairobi: United Nations
- Welsh, B. C., Braga, A. A., Bruinsma, G. J. N. (2015). Reimagining Broken Windows: From theory to policy. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 52(4), 447-463.
- WICI/Women in Cities International. (2010). *Creating Safer Communities for Marginalized women and everyone*. Montreal.
- WICI/Women in Cities International. (2014). *Reflecting on and acting for public spaces in Parc-Extension: Improving the safety of women and girls. Where are the women and girls?*, Montreal.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). Broken Windows: The police and neighborhood safety. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 211, 29-38.
- Zimbaro, P. (1973). A field experiment in autoshaping. In C. Ward (Ed.), *Vandalism* (pp. 85-90). London, UK: Architectural Press.
- Zimbaro, P. (2007). *The Lucifer Effect – Understanding how good people turn evil*. New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks.